

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Bowman-Amuah (US 6636424).

The Examiner rejected claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Blackman (US 6665573) in view of Bowman-Amuah (US 6636242).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102 and §103 rejections with the following arguments.

09/966,131

9

35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Bowman-Amuah (US 6636424). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Blackman (US 6665573) in view of Bowman-Amuah (US 6636242).

Since claims 7-17 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 7-17 is moot.

The amended claim 1 is distinguished from Bowman-Amuah by capturing the embodiment of the multi-handler system of FIG. 7 as described on page 8, line 13 - page 9, line 9 in Applicants' patent application, said embodiment characterized in claim 1 by:

"a view context sub-system including at least one a view context object which is arranged to, wherein the software system is configured to have the view context object: passed from the view sub-system to the first handler sub-system, passed from the first handler sub-system to the second handler sub-system such that the view context object is updated by at least one of the first handler sub-system and the second handler sub-system, and passed after being updated from the second handler sub-system to the view sub-system and subsequently used by the view sub-system to refresh a view."

In contrast, Bowman-Amuah discloses a system and method of assigning a first view to a first activity and to have the first activity initiate a second activity based on instructions received from the first view and to further assign a second view with the second activity and to display the second view.

In particular, Bowman-Amuah does not teach the aforementioned features of claim 1 relating to passing the view context object, which captures input and output data populating the presentation objects of the view sub-system, through a succession of handler sub-systems, wherein

the successive handler sub-systems update the view context object as the view context object is being passed through the successive handler subsystems, such that the updated view context object is used to refresh a view by the view subsystem.

In addition, claim 1 recites the view-subsystem, a business logic sub-system, and the handler subsystems. While the Examiner identified in Bowman-Amuah: a view-subsystem as the User Interface Component in FIG. 42, a business logic sub-system in FIG. 33, and a handler subsystem in FIG. 158 (with corresponding descriptions thereof in the text of Bowman-Amuah), Bowman-Amuah does not disclose the following features in claim 1 which recite interrelationships among the aforementioned sub-systems:

“first and second handler sub-systems, each said handler sub-system including controller objects which control a sequence of actions by the business logic sub-system in a use case, in response to an event triggered by the view sub-system”.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Bowman-Amuah does not anticipate claim 1, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 3-6 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 3-6 and are likewise in condition for allowance.

In addition, claim 18 recites the additional feature, not disclosed in Bowman-Amuah, of the view context object being updated by both the first handler sub-system and the second handler sub-system.

In addition, claim 18 recites the additional feature relating to a multi-threaded application (see specification, page 8, lines 1621), not disclosed in Bowman-Amuah, of the updated view context object being passed from the second handler sub-system to the view sub-system by: being

passed from the second handler sub-system to the first handler sub-system, and subsequently being passed from the first handler sub-system to the view sub-system.

New claims 20-26, drawn to a method, include the same features as claims 1, 3-6, and 18-19, respectively, and are therefore are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah and are in condition for allowance.

New claims 27-33, drawn to a computer program, include the same features as claims 1, 3-6, and 18-19, respectively, and are therefore are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Date: 04/12/2005

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850